

REMARKS

The present response is being submitted in reply to the Office action issued on December 5, 2006. Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. By the present response, claims 1-10, 12, 14 and 16-18 have been amended as discussed below. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the amendments being made hereby and of the following remarks.

Abstract

The Examiner has requested that the Applicant submit a clean copy of the Abstract as filed. In accordance with the Examiner's request, a clean copy of the Abstract is attached herewith.

Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings on the basis that they do not show every feature of the invention as specified in the claims and the Examiner has requested replacement drawings. However, it is respectfully submitted that the present application does not include drawings. Therefore, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. A brief discussion of this rejection in view of each claim is provided below.

Claim 1 – The Examiner states that the metes and bounds of the claim are unclear.

Specifically, the Examiner states that it is unclear if there are two types of non-pressure

sensitive polyacrylates contained by the adhesive. The Applicant submits that one of the features of the invention as recited in claim 1 is that the adhesive contains “a film-forming” polymer which is selected from the group of non-pressure-sensitive polyacrylates. This component is selected from the group of non-pressure-sensitive polyacrylates set forth in claim 1 as group (e). Therefore, the adhesive as set forth in claim 1 may comprise two different compounds derived from group (e), i.e., the group of non-pressure-sensitive polyacrylates. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify this point.

Claim 2 – The Examiner states that it is unclear if the “at least one acid anhydride group-containing polymer or co-polymer” is in addition to (d) or (e). It is submitted that the “at least one acid anhydride group-containing polymer or co-polymer” of claim 2 is in addition to that of claim 1 (the same applies to claim 3). Claim 2 has been amended accordingly.

Claims 4 – 7, 9 and 10 – The Examiner states that these claims are confusing and that the term “further comprising” should be inserted if the additional limitations are in addition to those of the primary claim. These claims have been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim 12 – The Examiner states that claim 1 already recites that the adhesive contains at least one film-forming polymer from the group of non-pressure polyacrylates and asks whether the group of polyacrylates is in addition to the non-pressure sensitive polyacrylates in claim 1. The Applicant submits that the group of non-pressure polyacrylates is in addition to the non-pressure sensitive polyacrylates in claim 1. Claim 12 has been amended accordingly.

Claim 14 – The Examiner states that it is unclear if the limitation in claim 14 is in addition to the limitations of claim 1 or a refinement of claim 1. Claim 14 is a refinement of claim 1 and has been amended in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion.

Claim 18 – The Examiner has rejected this claim on the basis that it provides for a use of an adhesive according to claim 1, but does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process. The Applicant submits that claim 18 has been amended accordingly to positively recite the steps, support for which may be found in the specification at paragraphs [000041] through [000055].

In light of the aforementioned explanations and amendments, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing claims and arguments, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if there are any remaining issues to be discussed which could expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 30, 2007

By: D. Peter Hochberg
D. Peter Hochberg
Reg. No. 24,603

D. Peter Hochberg Co., L.P.A.
1940 E. 6th St. – 6th Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114
(216) 771-3800
DPH/SM – Enclosure